D. JAY RITT, State Bar No. 138661 RITT, TAI, THVEDT & HODGES 1 COUNTY OF ORANGE 2 A Limited Liability Partnership CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER 65 North Raymond Avenue, Suite 320 Pasadena, California 91103 NOV 02 2012 3 (626) 685-2550 Tel: 4 Fax: (626) 685-2562 Attorneys for Third-Party Respondent OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE 5 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF ORANGE - CENTRAL DIVISION 9 10 ORLY TAITZ, Case No. 30-2012-00582135 11 Plaintiff. [Assigned to: Hon. Charles Marginis - Dept. C-19] 12 13 NOTICE OF RULING BARACK OBAMA, DIANE 14 FEINSTEIN, ELIZABETH EMKEN, Date: November 1, 2012 DAN HUGHES, RICK WILLIAMS, in 15 their capacity as candidates on the ballot, Time: 1:30 p.m. Dept: C-19 JOHN DOE, JANE DOE 1-100, 16 Defendants. 17 BY FAX 18 19

TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD HEREIN:

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on November 1, 2012, at 1:30 p.m., in Department "C19" of the above-entitled court, Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Production of Documents from Third Party Occidental College was held in the above-captioned action before the Honorable Charles Marginis.

Attorney D. JAY RITT of Ritt, Tai, Thvedt & Hodges specially appeared on behalf of Third Party Respondent OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE; and plaintiff ORLY TAITZ appeared in *pro per*. CARL BOTTERUD, General Counsel of Occidental College, was also present in the courtroom. There were no other appearances by any defendant or responding party.

1

Third Party Respondent Occidental College, and having considered the oral argument of counsel at the hearing on this matter, made the following findings:

(a) Ms. Taitz' "ex parte" motion to compel production of records from third-party

The Court having read the papers and pleadings filed by Plaintiff Orly Taitz and

- (a) Ms. Taitz' "ex parte" motion to compel production of records from third-party Occidental College was prepared, filed and served before Ms. Taitz even prepared, filed and served an underlying subpoena duces tecum itself;
- (b) The "ex parte" motion refers to a request for documents pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 2031.310 which applies by its terms only to parties and Occidental College is not a party in this action;
- (c) The subpoena which Ms. Taitz did ultimately prepare and serve (after her ex parte "motion") does not meet numerous requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 2020.510, in that, among other things;
- (d) The proof of service provided by Plaintiff reflects that the subpoena was served upon Occidental College on October 31, 2012, giving Occidental purportedly less than twenty-four hours notice to comply in direct conflict with the notice provisions of Section 2020.510;
- (e) The proof of service provided by Plaintiff reflects that the subpoena was improperly served by e-mail;
- (f) The subpoena was not accompanied by any Notice of Consumer Privacy Rights pursuant to California *Code of Civil Procedure* Section 1985.3, which by its terms applies to consumer records sought from a school such as Occidental College;
- (g) The documents and records sought are plainly confidential and protected as private and are not relevant to the claims at issue in this matter; and
- (h) Even had the subpoena been properly and timely prepared and served, and even if the subpoena sought records otherwise properly discoverable, the relief sought cannot be obtained via *ex parte* application per California Rule of Court 3.1200.